

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 6 and 18 to 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Foster. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 14 and 15

Claims 1, 14 and 15 recite a tool with “the first section being adjacent the second section at a fold center line, the perforation-free gap of the first section extending from the fold center line to the plurality of perforating teeth.”

The fold center line is a physical location on the tool which is not identified by the Office Action and, and the gap extending from the fold center line is also a structural part of the tool.

Foster does not show this limitation.

The Office Action states that: “It is believed that the structure in Foster is capable of providing a perforation-free gap extending from a fold center line to the plurality of perforating teeth.” No basis for this belief is provided.

Actually, the structure of Foster does not show such a perforation-free gap and does not provide this gap.

Even if the fold center line is not interpreted as a physical location on the tool (and it is), Foster could not be used for providing the perforation-free gap as claimed, as it would have to slid sideways, which would eliminate the perforation at the edges of the signatures which are desired and possibly even necessary in Foster.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 14 and 15 and its dependent claims, including claim 7, for this reason is respectfully requested.